

CONFIDENTIAL

7 October 1959

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director of Security

**SUBJECT: Revision of ECIS 11/2 - Control of Dissemination
and Use of Intelligence and Intelligence Information**

REFERENCE: Your Memorandum, same subject, 10 September 1959

1. We are pleased to see that an effort is being made to clarify and simplify the rather complex regulations currently in effect on the control of dissemination and we note with satisfaction that the number, at least, of central stamps has been reduced. Since the members of the group who have prepared this first draft of a new directive are intimately involved with the problems it deals with and are fully informed on the security needs of the community, our comments will be confined largely to the draft per se, pointing out the parts which appear to us to need some further clarification. We assume that minor editorial corrections will be made in due course.

2. The over-all outline and organization of the directive should be reviewed for the purpose of making it easier for the reader to find the information he is looking for. For example, paragraph 5 on page 8 has a subject heading in full caps although no other subject is similarly treated. (The interpolation of this matter on public release of information at this point seems illogical. If it belongs in this directive at all, it ought to be at the end, after the contractors.) The next caps are used for the central stamps themselves. Another example of inconsistency in structure is found on page 5 where an unnumbered paragraph heading is set off and underlined although no similar heading is found elsewhere. The entire section beginning with this heading up to the end of paragraph 7 needs to be reorganized.

3. We found certain paragraphs or statements ambiguous or otherwise lacking in clarity as follows:

a. Paragraph 1, last line, on page 1, beginning "and such information...." It is not clear what is meant by "documents [which] were otherwise generally made available to them."

b. Paragraph 4, page 2. Would it read better if it started with an "In order to" or "For the purpose of," then inverting the sentence? Isn't it "The standardized control stamps and procedures" that will be employed rather than "The standardization...."

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

- 2 -

c. Paragraphs 6 and 7, pages 3 and 4. Although paragraph 6 stipulates that "control stamps" will be used, on the following pages where the stamps are described they are variously called "marking stamps," "control markings," and "markings" but not "control stamps". This designation does not reappear until paragraph 8, several pages later.

d. Paragraph 7 on page 4, line 8 of the paragraph. The phrase "in order to provide, etc." seems unnecessary since "(b)" within the paragraph says substantially the same thing. In the same paragraph, is the intent of the phrase "the senior echelons of government" fully and adequately comprehended in the detailed statement immediately following?

e. Paragraph 7d on page 7. This very long and complex sentence would no doubt profit from punctuation which would set off the interpolated section on digests and summaries. However, since a, b, and c deal with the control stamp "NOFORN", it is confusing to have introduced at this point a parallel paragraph dealing with documents that do not carry the stamp.

f. Paragraph 9. It is not clear that the proviso in the subordinate clause is directed at the extent of the authority of the USIB committee. This statement needs to be recast, probably into two sentences.

4. Although it is no doubt too late to remedy the situation, it has seemed to us for some time that the introduction of the NOFORN stamp has tended to depreciate the basic classification of a document (Confidential, Secret, Top Secret). As stated in the presently effective directives, the absence of such a stamp does not mean that a document may be given to foreign nationals without permission of the originating agency. The basic classification already precludes such release unless it is specifically authorized. What useful purpose is served by the addition of this stamp? Since we also have the positive stamp indicating that a paper is releasable to specified governments (which seems to us an appropriate use of a stamp), the confusion is compounded. There are Secret NOFORN papers, Secret NOFORN Except papers, and Secret releasable papers. This leaves Secret papers definitely in an ambiguous category.

5. One final comment. Several references are made to actions that the Committee on Documentation of the USIB will take. This tends to leave the definitions in the current draft incomplete. Is there any feasible way that the substance of any of these determinations can be incorporated in the present paper?

25X1A

Deputy Assistant Director
National Estimates

CONFIDENTIAL